

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee.

v.

No. 99-4234

GEORGE THOMAS COLEMAN,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.  
James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge.  
(CR-98-422)

Submitted: April 20, 2000

Decided: July 25, 2000

Before WILKINS, WILLIAMS, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Jeffrey T. Twardy, Annandale, Virginia, for Appellant. Andrew  
James McKenna, Eric James Markovich, OFFICE OF THE UNITED  
STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See  
Local Rule 36(c).

## OPINION

### PER CURIAM:

George Coleman appeals his convictions and twenty-seven-month sentence for interstate transportation of a stolen vehicle in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. § 2312 (West Supp. 1999), possession of a vehicle stolen in another state in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. § 2313 (West Supp. 1999), and theft of personal property in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. § 661 (West Supp. 1999). Coleman's attorney has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting that (1) the district court erred in finding Coleman's confession was knowingly and voluntarily given; (2) Coleman's confession was not corroborated by other evidence; and (3) there was insufficient evidence to support Coleman's convictions. Counsel concluded, however, that there were no meritorious issues for appeal. Coleman was notified of his right to file a supplemental brief, but he has not done so.

We find Coleman's confession was knowingly and voluntarily given in accordance with both Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), and 18 U.S.C.A. § 3501 (West 1994). We further conclude that evidence presented at trial corroborated Coleman's confession and that there was sufficient evidence to support his jury convictions. See Glasser v. United States, 315 U.S. 60, 80 (1942).

In accordance with the requirements of Anders, we have reviewed the record for potential error and have found none. Therefore, we affirm Coleman's convictions and sentence. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the client. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid in the decisional process.

### AFFIRMED